DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 411 JC 770 435

AUTHOR Armistead, Blenda Woodard
TITLE The Virginia Community College System: An Examination After Its First Decade.
INSTITUTION State and Regional Higher Education Center, Florida.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 113p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *College Role; Community Colleges; Degrees (Titles); Educational Facilities; Educational Finance; *Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Enrollment Projections; Enrollment Trends; *Junior Colleges; Part Time Teachers; Statistical Data; *Summative Evaluation; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Virginia Community College System

ABSTRACT

This study examines the status of the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) after its first ten years of operation. In addition, it reviews the history and development of VCCS, explores its successes and failures as measured against the original expectations of 36 state governmental and educational leaders, and reports the aspirations for the system's future held by those same individuals. It reviews program offerings; facilities growth and utilization; enrollment trends; graduation awards by degree type and curriculum (1975-76); changes in the utilization of part-time faculty; faculty growth and characteristics; and appropriations and expenditures. Also presented are enrollment projections to 1987-88. As viewed by the 36 persons interviewed, VCCS had exceeded its initial goals; their recommendations for improving the system are summarized. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143411

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lou Bender

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM: AN EXAMINATION AFTER ITS FIRST DECADE

by

Blenda Woodard Armistead

Area of Education Management Systems
College of Education
Florida State University
September, 1977

A publication of the
State and Regional Higher Education Center
College of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

JC770435

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface i

Chapter 1: Introduction.....1

Chapter 2: In the Beginning: A Historical Perspective.....7

Chapter 3: A Decade Later: Facts and Figures.....21

Chapter 4: Selected Educational and Governmental Influentials: Initial Expectations.....61

Chapter 5: Perceived Successes and Failures.....73

Chapter 6: Future Expectations.....85

Chapter 7: Summary and Observations.....93

Appendix 100

Notes on the Authoress..... 103

PREFACE

The Virginia Community College System has earned national recognition for its growth, comprehensiveness, and achievements during its first decade of existence. As is so often the case, however, much of the recognition was derived more from claims or descriptions made by professionals within the community college system reporting before national organizations through speeches or addresses and even through print and visual media than from any external or systematic evaluation of the system. The focus of this monograph is on a study of the Virginia Community College System as part of a dissertation by the authoress. The monograph is essentially a report of the substantive findings of that study.

Two fundamental beliefs formed the basis for the design of the study. It was first predicated on a belief in the open-system model of organizations. Second, it was accepted as a belief that organizational goals can be utilized as a standard against which to measure the performance of that organization.

An acceptance of the open-system model of organizations leads to the conclusion that there are a wide variety of external, environmental factors which impinge upon the

organization and its goals. Because of this interaction, it is likely that the goals of an organization will change over time. Furthermore, the setting of goals for an organization is essentially a problem of defining desired relationships between an organization and its environment, since a change in either of these requires review and even, perhaps, alteration of proposed goals. The re-appraisal of goals, therefore, is a recurrent problem for organizations, and most likely a more constant problem in an unstable environment than in a stable one. The goals of Virginia's system of community colleges cannot be evaluated easily since it operates in a constantly changing environment. Yet, it is a task which needed to be undertaken for as Peter F. Drucker observed, institutions serving society need an organized audit of objectives and results in order that those objectives no longer serving a purpose can take action to realign their activities.[1]

The investigation reported in this monograph attempted to provide a critical examination of the Virginia Community College System as an audit of objectives and results from

---

[1]Peter F. Drucker, Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973) pp. 158-59.

its establishment in 1966 through the end of its first decade of existence. It is published here in the hope that such an audit will provide direction for realigning the system's goals, if this proves necessary, and guiding the system into the future.

This publication has been produced as part of the activities of the Florida State University/University of Florida Center for State and Regional Leadership established originally by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The FSU Center (now known as the State and Regional Higher Education Center) is committed to the pre-service and in-service training of professionals who serve in state or regional agencies concerned with postsecondary education. It is also committed to the study of issues and problems which confront these agencies or state systems. The FSU State and Regional Higher Education Center most recently has been active in co-sponsoring a series of conferences on state licensure and approval, the relationship of federal regulations with institutional operation, and the role of regional accreditation as part of the triad of governance in American postsecondary education.

Information concerning the FSU Center, its activities, or its publications is available on request. The Center welcomes comments and suggestions related to problems or issues toward which its resources might be directed.

We are indebted to Dr. Dana B. Hamel, Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, for his cooperation and support of this(as well as several others in the past) dissertation research effort involving the Virginia System.

We also wish to acknowledge with deep appreciation the willingness of Dr. Blenda Woodard Armistead to prepare the manuscript for this publication. She saw this as one avenue for expressing her own thanks to those individuals who gave of their time to be interviewed or otherwise contributed to her study of the Virginia Community College System.

Louis W. Bender, Center Director
and Professor of Higher Education

Chapter 1 : Introduction

After years of consideration and study, the Commonwealth of Virginia established its state community college system in 1966. Growth of the system has been dramatic. In 1966, the Virginia Community College System (hereafter also referred to as VCCS) enrolled approximately 3,500 students and spent $7.5 million for construction and operating costs. By the fall of 1975, the headcount enrollment exceeded 82,500 and appropriations for operating expenses in the 1974-76 biennium totaled approximately $132 million, making the institutions comprising the system an integral part of higher education in the Commonwealth.

A substantial commitment has been made by Virginia to develop its community colleges over the last decade. To date, however, there has been no systematic analysis of the extent to which the founders' expectations have been met. As the state's community colleges begin their second decade of operations, it is a particularly appropriate time at which to analyze the system's progress from a historical, as well as a future-oriented, perspective, for several reasons.

First, many of the state-level educational and governmental leaders responsible for promoting the community college concept in Virginia and having it formalized into legislation are still involved in the state's governmental

decision-making and higher educational leadership processes. The historical significance of cataloguing their perceptions for future reference is itself strong justification for the study. Additionally, the positions currently held by many of these individuals indicate that capturing and cataloguing their views of what has happened and what they think should happen could be influential in determining the future of the state's community college program.

Second, the community college system is nearing completion of its physical development stage. Institutions have been established in each of the regions outlined in the state's master plan for community college development and relatively little major construction in additional geographical regions is planned in the years ahead. The thrust of the community college system, therefore, is likely to shift from physical development into new arenas. A factual and quantitative analysis of the system's progress to date could help to determine possible new directions or emphases for the state's community colleges in the future.

Third, the environment in which higher education is currently operating within the State of Virginia is becoming increasingly analytical amid cries for accountability and fiscal stringency. Thus, external constraints make it unlikely that the community college program will continue to operate in the future as it has in the past.

The purpose of this monograph is to provide an evaluation of the past as well as directions for the future of VCCS. It explores the successes and failures of the community college system during its first decade of operation in meeting the original expectations of state governmental and educational leaders and examines the aspirations for the system's future held by these same individuals.

Thirty-six persons were invited to participate in formal interviews, including members of the executive and legislative branches of State government in Virginia, the State Board of Education, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, and the State Board for Community Colleges. These groups were selected because they were, in 1966, and are today, providing state-level leadership for higher education in Virginia.

Since the purpose of the interviews was to discover the views of educational and governmental leaders rather than to force their opinions into a pre-established, rigid framework, use of the elite interview, which allows the interviewee to outline the dimensions of the subject, was selected as the technique most likely to provide the type of desired response. Lewis Anthony Dexter defines an elite interview as "an interview with any interviewee ... who in terms of the current purposes of the interviewer is given

special non-standardized treatment."[1] By non-standardized treatment, Dexter means

1. Stressing the interviewee's definition of the situation
2. Encouraging the interviewee to structure the account of the situation
3. Letting the interviewee introduce to a considerable extent his notions of what he regards as relevant instead of relying upon the investigator's notions of relevance.[2]

In order to create maximum flexibility for the interviews, a formal interview schedule was not developed. Use of such a schedule when dealing with elites has, in fact, been discouraged because:

1. Respondents actively resent the restrictions placed upon them by the interview schedules
2. Respondents demand a more active interplay with the interviewer than the conventional schedule interview permits.[3]

It has been pointed out that, in general, elites seem comfortable with questions of broad content and with a high proportion of open questions.[4]

Individual members of the selected groups were requested

---

[1]Lewis Anthony Dexter, Elite and Specialized Interviewing (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970,p.5).

[2]Ibid.

[3]Stephen A. Richardson, Barbara Dohrenwent, and David Klein, Interviewing--Its Forms and Functions (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), p. 304.

[4]Ibid.

to supply information with regard to:

1. The expectations of the community college system that he/she sensed to be most prevalent state-wide at the time of the system's founding such as:

    a. Increasing educational opportunities for both youths and adults by providing accessible and low-cost programs

    b. Providing new postsecondary opportunities--particularly in occupational-technical fields

    c. Enhancing employment, industrial development, and economic growth in the state

2. The extent to which he/she was in agreement with the generally held expectations as well as other justifications the individual personally believed important to the founding of the system

3. The individual's perception of the degree of success or failure that the system has experienced during its first decade of operation in meeting the original expectations, as well as personal opinions and explanations for the outcomes

4. The respondent's opinions on how appropriate the original expectations of the state's community college system are for the next decade of community college operations in Virginia

5. Altered, expanded, or new aspirations which the

individual currently holds for the future of the state's community college system.

It is hoped that an assessment of the perceptions of key individuals associated with the development of the state's community college system regarding both its past successes and failures and its possibilities for the future will provide an evaluation of the past and important perspectives for guiding the system into its second decade of operation. In addition to reporting the results of the interviews, the following chapters will also examine the literature leading up to the system's founding and document the progress of the Virginia Community College System over its first ten years of operation.

Chapter 2 : In the Begining: A Historical Perspective

From a nation-wide perspective, community colleges were relatively late in coming to Virginia. Yet, when the 1966 Virginia General Assembly passed the legislation establishing a state system of public community colleges, it acted in response to educational needs which had been long recognized within the state. This chapter examines the literature prior to the system's founding from the perspective of the needs the system was established to meet and the goals originally set forth for it.

As George Vaughan has pointed out, evidence suggests that state leaders have been interested in the development of higher education in Virginia throughout much of this century.[1] As early as 1928, a study authorized by the

---

[1]George B. Vaughan, Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1971), p. 6.

General Assembly recognized the need for diversified higher educational opportunities within the state. The O'Shea report proposed that some students needed or desired a path of study other than the traditional liberal arts curriculum and went on to suggest a form of vocational education, although not to be offered at the collegiate level.[1] The same study also hinted at the present state system when it concluded that "the determination of what policy shall be pursued is a matter for the state to decide, and not for the educational institutions."[2]

Again in 1945, a legislatively-appointed commission called for making vocational education, this time at least partially post-high school in nature, available to all prospective students who might benefit from it.[3] While the commission went on record as favoring broader post-high school education in Virginia, no legislation was passed to make it possible.

Instead, the 1948 session of the Virginia General Assembly called for another study of higher education in the

[1] Public Education in Virginia: Report to the Educational Commission of Virginia of a Survey of the Public Educational System of the State (Richmond, Va.: Superintendent of Public Printing, 1928), p. 235.

[2] Ibid., p. 220.

[3] The Virginia Public School System: Report of the Virginia Education Commission (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchase and Printing, 1945), p. 109.

state. While the legislatively-appointed body did not conduct the study, it did submit guidelines for it, including consideration of the possibility of establishing a state-wide system of community colleges. The guidelines stated that these colleges should provide technical and semi-professional training, post-high school occupational training, preparation for professional schools, liberal arts education and general education close to the homes of many students.[1] The consultant who conducted the actual study requested by the General Assembly concluded that the state needed "short technical and semi-professional courses to prepare for the many types of callings which require post-high school training but do not require four-year curricula."[2] While the recommendations did not include that of a comprehensive community college system, more branch campuses and an increase in extension work were recommended. Apparently the Virginia legislature was not yet ready in 1951 to take the initiative in establishing expanded higher educational opportunities, for there was no state-wide action in response to the consultant's report.

Several years later, the General Assembly adopted a

---

[1] Report of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Research Committee on Education of the Governor's Advisory Council on the Virginia Economy (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1950), pp. 10-11.

[2] Higher Education in Virginia: Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchase and Printing, 1951), pp. 4-5.

joint resolution directing a Virginia Advisory Legislative Council (VALC) study and report on the extension services of state institutions of higher education. The study highlighted the problem of the growing number of college-age students and the lack of facilities to meet their needs. It also emphasized the desire to provide adequate opportunities by stating that "It has been constantly borne in mind that higher education must and will be provided for the youth of this state."[1] The recommended solution called for the establishment of two-year branches of existing higher educational institutions and specifically rejected the community college concept.[2] Yet, many of the advantages cited regarding branch campuses—less expensive than four-year colleges, no need for dormitories, the ability to service students not able to gain admission to senior institutions, the potential to train skilled personnel for industry—could have applied equally well to community colleges. Thus, much of what was finally incorporated into the 1966 community college legislation was actually advocated in the 1955 study.

The late 1950's produced the first major study to make a thorough examination of the desirability and

---

[1] The Crisis in Higher Education in Virginia and a Solution: Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchase and Printing, 1955), p. 8.

[2] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

feasibility of establishing a system of comprehensive two-year colleges in the State of Virginia. Authorized by the Virginia State Council of Higher Education and directed by S. V. Martorana, then associated with the U. S. Office of Education, the purpose of the report was to "provide basic information and orientation on Virginia's need for two-year post-high school education."[1]

The study looked at several factors in assessing the need for post-high school education in Virginia. Using what were termed "conservative" population estimates, the report projected that the state should plan for twice as many college students in 1970 as there were in 1959.[2] It also pointed out that Virginia was "fast moving from an agricultural to an industrial economy, with consequent need for occupational upgrading and retraining of her current working force."[3] Another factor highlighted by the 1959 study was the weak holding power of the schools—approximately four out of ten students were being lost from Virginia schools between the eighth and twelfth grades. The fact that this situation was improving implied that in the future the state could expect more students to complete high school, with the probable result of more high school graduates seeking college

---

[1] Needs, Policies, and Plans for 2-Year Colleges in Virginia (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, State Council of Higher Education, 1959), p. ix.

[2] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[3] Ibid., p. 28.

entrance.[1] The study also noted that in 1959 83.5 percent of the counties and 42.0 percent of the cities in Virginia provided no educational opportunities beyond high school. Since there is a positive relationship between the tendency of high school graduates to continue their education and the proximity of an institution of higher education to their homes, the report concluded that the large number of areas offering no higher education pointed to gaps in the education opportunity afforded to the citizens of Virginia.[2]

Based on all of these findings, the study recommended that the state's higher education establishment be expanded and decentralized by the development of a number of two-year colleges. The report called for these colleges to offer comprehensive programs immediately above the high school level in order to serve the diverse interests and abilities of the population of the local communities. More specifically, arts and sciences at the freshman/sophomore college level, organized occupational programs leading directly to employment after one or two years of preparation, and a wide array of adult education and community-service programs were outlined as being needed.[3]

The study group also believed that a decentralized system of two-year colleges would be economical for both the

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[2]Ibid., p. 2.

[3]Ibid., p. 5.

state and the student, since the student would save money by living at home and the state would save by not having to build dormitories.[1] In addition, it was hoped that a decentralized system would be capable of responding to local needs.

The implementation plan proposed by the study differed in several significant ways from the actual principles upon which the state's community college system was founded. For example, the 1959 study recommended that the existing system of higher education be used to establish and control the new two-year colleges rather than advocating an independent system of two-year colleges, as was created in 1966.[2] Yet, despite such differences, the 1959 report went a long way towards endorsing the community college concept in the form in which it was finally implemented in Virginia.

However, it was not this report which directly brought about the state's community college system. Although supported by the state's higher education coordinating council in its 1960 Biennial Report to the Governor and the General Assembly,[3] the community college issue failed to reach the floor of the state legislature in the next session. Despite the lack of immediate action, the concepts

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Ibid., pp. 4-14.

[3] Biennial Report of the State Council of Higher Education to the Governor of Virginia and the General Assembly of Virginia: 1958-60 (Richmond, Va.: State Council of Higher Education, 1960).

outlined in the study continued to receive support. The Education Committee of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce issued a report in 1963 recommending that two-year institutions be established wherever they were clearly needed and that the base of higher education in the state be widened considerably.[1] In the same year, the Council of Presidents of State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education also supported the idea of expanding the higher educational opportunities in the state.[2]

In the early 1960's, opportunity for education beyond high school was limited. Most public colleges and universities in the state had restricted capacity, selective admissions, and costly tuition. Eight of thirteen public colleges and universities admitted only men or only women students and most required above average academic qualifications. Availability of two-year education was equally limited. Only four percent of all collegiate students were enrolled in two-year schools. In addition to constraints of size, the state was unable to meet the increasing demand for skilled technicians required by industries moving into the area.

There is little doubt that an awareness of new

---

[1] Higher Education and the Economic Development of Virginia (Richmond, Va.: Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, 1963), pp. 76-77.

[2] Higher Education and Economic Development in Virginia: A Special Report of the Council of Presidents, State-Aided Institutions of Higher Learning in Virginia (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1963).

post-high school educational needs was developing in Virginia in the early 1960s. The 1962 General Assembly created a Commission on Vocational and Technical Education, known as the Slaughter Commission, to recommend a course of action for improving vocational and technical education in public post-high school institutions. The Commission reported that "the nature of jobs now available in Virginia business and industry demands a higher level of skills from more people than is now afforded by the available vocational and technical training."[1] The Commission also noted that changing conditions were eliciting greater respect for the status and dignity of workers with vocational training.[2] In order to serve the diverse needs which existed, the Commission membership recognized that vocational curricula must undergo constant revision and be designed to meet the opportunities for employment in the institutions' local communities. The Commission also articulated the belief that the greatest need for expansion of vocational and technical training was at the post-high school level.[3]

In response to the Commission's call for increasing vocational educational opportunities in the state, the 1964

---

[1] Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia: Present and Future Needs: Report of the Commission on Vocational Education to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia (Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Purchases and Supply, 1963), p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 14.

General Assembly established the State Board of Technical Education and the Department of Technical Education, empowered to establish and administer area vocational and technical schools. The institutions to be established were non-residential, multi-purpose, and area-centered, as outlined in the Guide for the Establishment of Technical Colleges in Virginia.[1] The legislation specified that the schools should provide: "vocational and technical education to persons who have completed or left high school . . . who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market or for part-time study after entering the labor market."[2]

While the 1963 Vocational Education Commission laid the foundation for the system of technical colleges established in 1964, it also suggested that:

> In the long run, the state should consider meeting all of these post-high school educational needs through a system of comprehensive community colleges under the proposed State Board of Technical Education, perhaps with a more appropriate title. Consequently, the Commission recommends that the parent institutions (Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of Virginia, and The College of William and Mary), the Council of Higher Education and the State Board of Technical Education make a joint study of the feasibility of such a system, with particular emphasis upon such problems as accreditation, transfer of credits and financial savings.[3]

---

[1] Guide for the Establishment of Technical Colleges in Virginia (Richmond, Va.: State Department of Technical Education, 1965).

[2] Virginia, Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia (1964), chap. 405, p. 672.

[3] Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia, pp. 15-16.

Following this suggestion, the 1964 session of the General Assembly made provisions for the appointment of the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission. The Commission, headed by John Dale Russell, was concerned with a broad range of issues that related to increased educational opportunity including projected college enrollments, admissions policies, facility planning, faculty compensation, geographic location, and community needs. Noting that growth in college enrollments for the next five years (1965-70) was expected to equal that of the preceding decade and a half, the Commission recommended that each aspect of higher education be expanded and diversified. Its highest priority, however, was given to establishing community colleges, which the Commission identified as necessary to fill "the most significant gap in Virginia's present provision of higher education."[1] "There can be no other conclusion," the Commission stated, "but that Virginia is failing to provide higher education within its borders to the extent that would be justified by the relation of the state's population and economic resources to the national totals."[2]

A community college was defined in terms of general concepts and usage in other states. The comprehensive

---

[1] Report of the Higher Education Study Commission (Richmond, Va.: State Council of Higher Education, 1965), p. 22.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

community college was understood to carry students two years beyond high school graduation in diversified curricula to gain vocational competence as well as credits transferable toward a bachelor's degree. It was assumed that each community in which a school was located would participate in institutional policy-making and that course offerings would be tailored to regional needs.

Members of the 1966 Virginia General Assembly were confronted with the rationales and recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission. Additional impetus for the establishment of community colleges was provided through the strong support of Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr. In his message to the combined houses of the legislature in 1966 he stated, "If we look at the numbers of potential students, and if we also look at the relative costs involved, the implication is clear that a community college system is the quickest, and most efficient, the most economical, in fact, virtually the only way the future demands of our young people can be met."[1]

The recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission became the basis of the community college legislation passed by the General Assembly in 1966. The statute defines a comprehensive community college by the types of education offered:

Comprehensive Community College means an institution of

---

[1]Virginia, Journal of the Senate of Virginia (1966), p. 165.

higher education which offers instruction in one or more of the following fields:

1 - freshman and sophomore courses in arts and sciences acceptable for transfer in baccalaureate degree programs;
2 - diversified technical curricula including programs leading to the associate degree;
3 - vocational and technical education leading directly to employment; and
4 - courses in general and continuing education for adults in the above fields.[1]

Based on the above guidelines, the Virginia Community College System began operation in 1966, with high expectations held for it throughout the state.

---

[1]Virginia, Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia (1966), chap. 679, p. 1137.

Chapter 3 : A Decade Later: Facts and Figures

Between 1966 and 1976, the Virginia Community College System developed into a major sector of higher education in the Commonwealth. While there are innumerable factors which could be examined to document the system's development, the following six have been selected to provide a summary description: system development, student enrollments, program offerings, faculty, finances and facilities.

System Development

Prior to 1966, there were fifteen state-controlled postsecondary institutions within the state operating at the two-year level. Of these, twelve were branch institutions operating under the auspices of three of the senior institutions. The remaining three state two-year institutions were technical institutes operated by three other senior institutions.

The 1966 Community College Act provided for the transfer of seven of the two-year branch institutions to the system at a future date, the conversion of the three technical institutes into community colleges, and the immediate transfer of the post-high school programs in five area vocational/technical schools to the community college program.

The Master Plan of the Community College System divided the state into twenty-two regions to be served by a community college.[1] Table 1 displays the chronological development of this system of institutions.

The 1966-67 fiscal year began with two community colleges and the post-high school programs of five area vocational schools under the supervision of the Department of Community Colleges.

In 1972-73, seven years after the passage of the community college enabling legislation, the Virginia Community College System had established its twenty-three institutions. By 1975-76, these institutions incorporated thirty-three campuses providing postsecondary educational opportunities within commuting distance of Virginians in all regions of the state.

Enrollment Growth

The rapid expansion of Virginia's community college system is perhaps best documented by the growth in the number of students being served by these institutions.

---

[1]One region was to have two community colleges.

TABLE 1

CHRONOLOGY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Institution	1966/ 1967	1967/ 1968	1968/ 1969	1969/ 1970	1970/ 1971	1971/ 1972	1972/ 1973	1973/ 1974	1974/ 1975	1975/ 1976
Blue Ridge		O	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Central Virginia		X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Dabney S. Lancaster		X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Danville		X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Eastern Shore						X	----	----	----	----
Germanna					O	----	----	----	----	----
J. Sargeant Reynolds							O	----	----	----
John Tyler		O	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Lord Fairfax					O	----	----	----	----	----
Mountain Empire							O	----	----	----
New River				X	----	----	----	----	----	----
Northern Virginia	X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Patrick Henry						X	----	----	----	----
Paul D. Camp						O	----	----	----	----
Piedmont Virginia							O	----	----	----
Rappahannock						O	----	----	----	----
Southside Virginia					O	----	----	----	----	----
Southwest Virginia			O	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Thomas Nelson			O	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Tidewater			X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Virginia Highlands				X	----	----	----	----	----	----
Virginia Western	X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Wytheville		X	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

NOTE: X = Formed from existing institution
O = New institution

SOURCE: Data Files, Virginia Department of Community Colleges (Richmond, Virginia: 1976).

In the fall of 1966, the first year of operation for the VCCS, about thirty-five thousand students enrolled in community college programs. Ten years later, in the fall of 1975, over 82,500 individuals engaged in such activities, for an increase in the number of fall headcount students of over 2000 percent in a single decade. The relative importance of this growth in terms of the entire Virginia system of higher education is exhibited in Table 2. As is demonstrated, community college sutdents, who accounted for 6 percent of the total in 1966, comprised 42 percent of the total headcount enrollment in state-supported institutions of higher education in 1975. While the most dramatic increases were experienced in the first several years, between 1971-72 and 1975-76 the annual rate of growth was at least 20 percent.

The same trend, although slightly less pronounced, is seen in the pattern of full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollments, Table 3. Virginia's community colleges served 2395 FTE students, 4 percent of the total, in the 1966-67 academic year, and almost 32 percent of the total higher educational FTE students, forty-five thousand in 1975-76. The ten year increase was over 1700 percent, again with substantive gains in each of the years.

The somewhat lower percentage growth in FTE than in headcount enrollments is due to the fact that the number of

TABLE 2

FALL HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

1966-67 to 1975-76

	Senior Institutions		Community Colleges		Other 2-Year Institutions	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
1966-67	56,057	87	3,578	6	4,476	7
1967-68	62,175	84	9,351	12	2,871	4
1968-69	66,116	77	16,120	19	3,515	4
1969-70	72,370	76	22,011	23	1,175	1
1970-71	78,316	73	27,466	25	1,785	2
1971-72	84,923	72	32,705	27	886	1
1972-73	91,102	68	41,723	31	858	1
1973-74	96,880	64	52,485	35	877	1
1974-75	103,285	61	64,817	38	912	1
1975-76	111,340	57	82,504	42	1,071	1
10-yr %	98.62		2305.87		.24	

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

TABLE 3

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT

1966-67 to 1975-76

	Senior Institutions		Community Colleges		Other 2-Year Institutions	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
1966-67	49,083	89	2,395	4	3,696	7
1967-68	53,892	87	6,121	10	2,082	3
1968-69	57,640	81	10,874	15	2,423	4
1969-70	63,322	80	14,652	19	763	1
1970-71	69,466	78	18,869	21	895	1
1971-72	74,135	74	25,066	25	700	1
1972-73	79,853	73	28,844	26	663	1
1973-74	82,822	72	30,903	27	602	1
1974-75	88,921	69.8	38,004	29.7	607	.5
1975-76	95,439	67.6	45,084	31.9	676	.5
10-yr %	94		1782.42		.18	

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

part-time students enrolling in community colleges is increasing at a faster rate than the number of full-time students. In 1975-76, part-time students comprised 60 percent of the total community college headcount enrollment as compared with 43 percent during 1970-71.

In addition to the increasing proportion of part-time students at Virginia's community colleges, several other enrollment statistics are noteworthy. Virginia residents accounted for 95 percent of the total 1974 fall quarter enrollment which indicates that the system is oriented towards meeting the needs of the Commonwealth. The 1974 fall quarter enrollment was comprised of 54 percent men and 46 percent women, an increase in the proportion of women students over previous years. The 15 percent minority representation in the 1974 fall enrollment also demonstrated a proportional growth in the enrollment of minority students.

A survey of 1974-75 first-time community college students revealed that 40 percent of the men were veterans while another 8 percent were active-duty servicemen. Of the students surveyed, almost half, 43 percent, indicated that they had enrolled in a community college to prepare for specific jobs, career fields, or general employment. Twenty-one percent said they planned to transfer to four-year colleges and universities, with the remaining 36 percent attending to increase their general knowledge or for personal satisfaction. The average age for these 1974-75 first-time

students was about twenty-six years, with a range in age from seventeen-year-old high school graduates to senior citizens.

Enrollments at the state's community colleges have been projected by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia to increase through 1987-88. As is shown in Table 4, the anticipated growth is not as dramatic as that experienced in the last decade. However, between 1976-77 and 1985-86, fall headcount and full-time equivalent enrollments at the community colleges are projected to increase by 44 and 38 percent, respectively. The majority of the growth is expected in the late 1970s. If the projections for all state institutions of higher education materialize, the community colleges will be serving 47 percent of the headcount and 36 percent of the full-time equivalent students by 1984-85. These percentages are expected to remain constant through 1987-88, with enrollments at the state's senior institutions and community colleges growing at approximately the same rate.

In addition to the numbers and types of students described above who have or are projected to enroll in the credit programs of the state's community colleges, thousands of other Virginians have and will continue to avail themselves of the system's non-state funded, non-credit community service programs. These programs are designed for self-enrichment and to provide opportunities for individuals

TABLE 4

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

1976-77 to 1987-88

	Fall Headcount		Full-Time Equivalent	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
1976-77	81,535	41	44,119	31
1977-78	90,813	43	48,003	32
1978-79	97,440	44	51,797	33
1979-80	103,361	45	54,638	34
1980-81	107,653	46	56,699	35
1981-82	110,209	46	57,925	35
1982-83	112,602	47	58,916	35
1983-84	114,574	47	59,772	35
1984-85	116,020	47	60,310	36
1985-86	117,281	47	60,721	36
1986-87	118,031	47	60,904	36
1987-88	118,674	47	61,149	36

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

to further their skills. In addition, still other state citizens are benefited by receiving specific job training from the Special Training Division of the Virginia Department of Community Colleges.

Program Offerings

Concurrent with the rise in community college enrollments over the decade has been an expansion of the system's program offerings.

Community college programs are designed to fulfill the educational and training needs within each region of the state. They can be classified into five major types, as follows: (1) occupational and technical curricula created to prepare individuals for employment, (2) college transfer curricula offering the first two years of a traditional baccalaureate program, (3) adult continuing education courses, (4) foundation or remedial work, and (5) special training programs for new and expanding industries. This discussion will focus on the first two curricula, occupational/technical and college transfer, since they are the major thrusts of the state's community colleges.

In 1966-67, college transfer programs were available in business administration, liberal arts, pre-engineering, preteacher education, and science within the community college system. Fourteen occupational/technical programs at the associate degree level were also offered to students during the first year of the system's operation. These were

accounting; architectural, civil, mechanical and electrical engineering technologies; automotive diagnostics; business management; commercial art; data processing; drafting and design technology; electronics technology; nursing; police science; and secretarial science. About 84 percent of the community college students were engaged in the technical and occupationally-oriented programs during the 1966-67 year. By the 1966-67 graduation, 164 community college students had completed associate degrees, accounting for almost 40 percent of the associate degrees conferred in the state in that year.

Just two years later, in 1968-69, the community colleges graduated 1184 individuals, 82 percent of whom were in the occupational/technical fields. Occupational/technical offerings added since 1966-67 included such diverse curricula as agricultural and chemical technologies, cosmetology, food service management, merchandising and distribution, printing, real estate and welding. In all, over thirty occupational/technical curricula were offered within the system during 1968-69, in addition to five college transfer programs.

In 1970-71, the community colleges presented 2196 awards, of which 71 percent were Associate in Applied Science degrees, certificates, and diplomas in career-oriented curricula, while 29 percent were Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees in college transfer programs. During the same year, nearly eighty occupational/technical curricula

were offered within the state's community college system, a substantial increase over the thirty occupational/technical programs available in 1968-69. Available for the first time in 1970-71 at Virginia's community colleges were such specialized curricula as marine technology, radio and television production technology, and traffic and transportation technology.

The community college emphasis on occupational/technical programs continued into 1972-73, with all but seven of the 107 different curricula offered during that year in the career-oriented fields. Of the 4026 associate degrees, diplomas, and certificates presented by the community colleges in 1972-73, 66 percent were in occupational/technical fields leading graduates directly into jobs. Again in 1974-75, the percentage of awards conferred in occupational/technical as compared to college transfer programs remained high, 67 and 33 percent, respectively.

Table 5 reveals the distribution of graduation awards conferred in 1975-76 across degree types and curricula. In addition to exhibiting a continuing emphasis on occupational/technical programs, the table demonstrates the exceedingly broad range of academic curricula available within the state's system of community colleges, especially when compared with the nineteen programs offered during the first year the system was in operation.

The shifting of student interest in the various types

TABLE 5

VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
GRADUATION AWARDS CONFERRED BY DEGREE TYPE AND CURRICULUM
1975-1976

	N	PCT
Associate in Arts		
Art Education	7	.1
Fine Arts	29	.4
Liberal Arts	187	2.6
Music	13	.2
Sub-Total	236	3.3
Associate in Science		
Business Admin	561	7.9
Education	523	7.4
Engineering	58	.8
General Studies	357	5.0
Science	261	3.7
Sub-Total	1760	24.8
Associate in Applied Science		
Accounting	226	3.2
Ag Business	18	.3
Agronomy	3	-
Air Con Refrig	11	.2
Air T C	15	.2
Animal Science	34	.5
Architecture	35	.5
Automotive	29	.4
Aviation Admin	1	-
Banking/Finance	18	.3
Broadcast Engr	8	.1
Chemical	1	-
Civil	45	.6
Commercial Art	68	1.0
Com Soc Serv	31	.4
Construction	4	.1
Corrections Sc	26	.4
Crafts	2	-
Data Processing	126	1.8
Dent Lab	19	.3
Dietetics	2	-
Draft Design	122	1.7
Educ Services	12	.2
Elec/Elec	208	2.9
Envir Science	8	.1
Envir Sci Tech	4	.1
Fire Science	100	1.4
Forestry	21	.3
HRI Mgt	43	.6
Industrial	15	.2
Inst Security	2	-
Instrumentation	20	.3
Machine	13	.2
Management	631	8.9
Marine Science	15	.2
Mechanical	42	.6
Media Ad Arts	8	.1
Medical Lab	48	.7
Medical Record	15	.2
Mental Health	51	.7
Merchandising	49	.7
Mining	9	.1
Mortuary Sci	21	.3
Nat Res Mgt	7	.1
Nursing	468	6.6
Occup Safety	12	.2
Phys Therapy	17	.2
Police Science	437	6.1
Public Admin	1	-
Radiology	28	.4
Radio TV Prod	8	.1
Real Estate	24	.3
Rec Parks	29	.4
Resp Therapy	17	.2
Sec Science	364	5.1
Traffic Trans	11	.2
Wildlife	4	.1
Sub-Total	3606	50.7

TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Diploma/Certificate	N	PCT
Accounting	1	-
Air Con Refrig	69	1.0
Animal Husband	1	-
Arch Draft	2	-
Auto Analysis	82	1.2
Auto Body	13	.2
Auto Diagnosis	3	-
Auto Machinist	2	-
Bookkeeping	15	.2
Bld Constr	3	-
Bus Ind Super	56	.8
Carpentry	3	-
Child Care	35	.5
Citizen Devel	2	-
Clerical Stud	232	3.3
Comp Mach Opr	9	.1
Com Career Dv	16	.2
Corrections	18	.3
Data Processing	41	.6
Dent Assist	4	.1
Diesel Mech	8	.1
Drafting	46	.6
Draft Design	20	.3
Erl Chld Devel	5	.1
Educ Sec	21	.3
Elec/Elec	44	.6
Electricity	65	.9
Electronics	3	-
Electron Serv	30	.4
Environ Con Opr	22	.3
Farm Opr Mgt	5	.1
Firefighting	11	.2
Food Ser Mgt	32	.5
Gen Business	3	-
Gen Merchand	11	.2
Health Tech	2	-
Horse Live Mgt	2	-
Hotel Mot Mgt	5	.1
Human Services	9	.1
Industrial F S	4	.1
Industrial Main	7	.1
Industrial Mgt	10	.1
Law Enforce	68	1.0
Legal Assistant	4	.1
Machine Opr	4	.1
Machine Shop	24	.3
Machine Tool	17	.2
Med Lab Asst	9	.1
Mine Mach Main	7	.1
Nursing Asst	49	.7
Opticianry	3	-
Perip Equip Op	14	.2
Plumbing	11	.2
Pract Nursing	50	.7
Printing	7	.1
Public Admin	1	-
Real Estate	5	.1
Records Mgt	6	.1
Resp Ther Tech	38	.5
Stenography	75	1.1
Te/Inst Aide	15	.2
Tech Illustra	1	-
Transportation	1	-
Travel Tourism	10	.1
Vend Mach Serv	6	.1
Water Well Dr	2	-
Welding	33	.5
Sub-Total	1506	21.2
Grand Total	7108	100.0

Source: Graduation Awards Conferred 1975-76, Division of Research and Planning, Virginia Department of Community Colleges, 1976, pp. 20-21.

of degrees and disciplines between 1970-71 and 1975-76 is shown in Table 6. There has been an increase in the percentage of degrees conferred in the occupational/technical area and a consequent decrease in the proportion of college transfer degrees awarded. The number of college transfer degrees awarded annually increased 186 percent during the five-year period, while the number of occupational/technical degrees increased by 237 percent. Within the occupational/technical field, the areas of health and public service technologies experienced significant increases. On the other hand, business and engineering technologies declined in terms of their relative proportion of the total number of degrees.

The degree statistics cited above provide one measure of the programs of the VCCS. However, the community colleges cannot be described solely in terms of the number and types of degrees conferred. Many individuals participate in community college activities for purposes other than formal degree programs. The institutions' community service programs provide self-enrichment opportunities for many Virginians; the colleges serve as cultural centers sponsoring concerts, plays and exhibits; through cooperative efforts with local, state and federal governmental agencies, industries, business and community groups, the community colleges provide activities of special regional interest. Community college programs have been designed for specific groups such as inmates of the state correctional facilities,

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF DEGREES CONFERRED BY DISCIPLINE
VIRGINIA TWO-YEAR STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS

Discipline	1970-71 Degrees	1970-71 % of Total	1975-76 Degrees	1975-76 % of Total
College Transfer	715	41	2,049	37
Occupational Technical	1,032	59	3,478	63
Agricult. & Nat. Res. Tech.	17	1	71	1
Arts & Design Tech.	30	2	46	1
Business Tech.	537	31	1,450	26
Engr./Industrial Tech.	271	16	554	10
Health Tech.	115	7	716	13
Public Service Tech.	62	4	641	12
Total	1,747		5,527	

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

senior citizens and active-duty servicemen. For individuals who are weak in the basic subjects, the community colleges offer developmental studies leading to entry into regular credit programs. In addition, programs of the Special Training Division are designed toward specific job opportunities. Although not as easily quantified as the number of graduates in the formal degree programs of the state's community colleges, the wide range of other activities must also be acknowledged in any examination of the program offerings of the VCCS.

Faculty

As the number of students attending the state's community colleges has grown and the institutions' program offerings have expanded, the number of faculty members employed by the system has also increased. As displayed in Table 7, the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional staff at the community colleges grew by over 1200 percent between 1966 and 1975. Over the same ten-year period FTE faculties grew 148 percent at the senior institutions.

The growth rate of headcount faculty at the community colleges almost kept pace with the increase in FTE faculty, while the percentage increase in headcount faculty at the senior institutions was only half that of the full-time equivalent faculty. It appears, therefore, that the senior institutions are employing a larger percentage of full-time faculty or utilizing most individual part-time faculty

members to a greater extent than in 1966. The community colleges, on the other hand, have maintained about the same utilization of part-time to full-time faculty throughout the decade. The result has been a greater disparity between the ratios of headcount to FTE faculty at the community college as compared to the senior institutions. Table 7 presents, for the years 1970-71 and 1975-76, a comparison of part-time to total headcount faculty. The community colleges were the heaviest users of part-time faculty in 1975-76, and between 1970-71 and 1975-76, were the only group of institutions to increase their use of part-time faculty as a percentage of total faculty members employed.

The size of a faculty is dependent, at least in part, upon the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students enrolled. A common measure of faculty, therefore, is the number of FTE students served per FTE faculty member, i.e., a student/faculty ratio. The ratios at Virginia's senior institutions and community colleges in both 1966-67 and 1975-76 are shown in Table 8. At the senior institutions, a faculty member taught fewer students, on the average, in 1975-76 than in 1966-67. The reverse is true for the community colleges. In fact, in 1966-67, the first year the VCCS was in operation, the average community college faculty member taught fewer students than his/her counterpart at the senior institutions. This occurrence is attributable to the newness of the community colleges in 1966-67 and the rela-

TABLE 7

CHANGES IN THE UTILIZATION OF PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

1970 to 1975

	1970 Part-time Headcount / Total Headcount	Part-time Headcount as a Percent of Total Headcount	1975 Part-time Headcount / Total Headcount	Part-time Headcount as a Percent of Total Headcount	Difference in Percent Part-time 1970-1975
All Institutions	2,028 / 7,886	26	3,199 / 12,605	25	-1
Doctoral	1,355 / 4,591	30	969 / 5,707	17	-13
Other 4-year and Richard Bland	215 / 1,850	12	169 / 2,600	7	-5
Community Colleges	458 / 1,445	32	2,061 / 4,298	48	+16

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

TABLE 8

FACULTY GROWTH
VIRGINIA'S PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
1966-67 to 1975-76

	1966-67	1975-76	10-Year Percentage Increase
Community Colleges			
Headcount Faculty	347	4,298	1139
FTE Faculty	209.55	2,817.07	1244
Ratio: Headcount to FTE Faculty	1.66:1	1.53:1	
Ratio: FTE Students to FTE Faculty	11.43:1	16.00:1	
Senior Institutions			
Headcount Faculty	4,774	8,245	73
FTE Faculty	2,949.37	7,314.97	148
Ratio: Headcount to FTE Faculty	1.62:1	1.13:1	
Ratio: FTE Students to FTE Faculty	16.64:1	13.05:1	

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

tively small numbers of students enrolled. By 1975-76, the ratios were 13.05:1 and 16.00:1 at the senior institutions and the community colleges, respectively.

An examination of the demographic characteristics of community college faculty members in 1966-67, 1970-71 and 1975-76 reveals several shifts. The percentage of female faculty members has increased from 26 percent in 1966-67 to 34 percent in 1975-76, Table 9. The ten year percentage increases for males and females were 1076 and 1543 percent, respectively. The age distribution of the VCCS faculty is shown in Table 10. Over the decade, the younger age groups have experienced the greatest growth. The most noticeable increase was in the thirty to thirty-nine age bracket. In 1966-67, 31 percent of the community college instructional staff was in this age bracket; ten years later, the percentage had increased to 40.

There has been a marked change in the distribution of community college faculty across academic ranks between 1966-67 and 1975-76. As displayed in Table 11, the proportion of the faculty in the professor, associate professor, assistant professor and lecturer ranks increased over the decade. Instructors at the community colleges, however, comprised 75 percent of the faculties in 1966-67 and only 17 percent in 1975-76. Of the ranks increasing their proportions of the total, that of lecturer showed the most significant advancement.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF VCCS FACULTY BY SEX

	1966-67		1970-71		1975-76	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Male	241	69	1,017	70	2,835	66
Female	89	26	428	30	1,463	34
Not Indicated	17	5	0	0	0	0
Total	347	100	1,445	100	4,298	100

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF VCCS FACULTY BY AGE

	1966-67		1970-71		1975-76	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Under 30	85	24	338	23	1,072	25
30-39	107	31	503	35	1,728	40
40-49	79	23	325	22	838	19
50-59	42	12	211	15	508	12
60 and Over	17	5	68	5	152	4
Not Indicated	17	5	0	0	0	0
Total	347	100	1,445	100	4,298	100

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF VCCS FACULTY BY ACADEMIC RANK

	1966-67		1970-71		1975-76	
Professor	2	1	19	1	133	3
Associate Professor	11	3	99	7	481	11
Assistant Professor	39	11	370	26	853	20
Instructor	261	75	501	35	743	17
Lecturer	22	6	445	31	2,061	48
Other	12	3	11	1	27	1
Total	347	99	1,445	101	4,298	100

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

Another faculty characteristic frequently cited is tenure percentages. The VCCS discontinued its tenure system in 1972 in favor of a contract appointment procedure. Any qualified faculty member in the system who was granted tenure prior to 1972 could elect to retain tenure status or accept a multi-year contract. As a result, there are only a small number of tenured faculty in Virginia's community colleges. In 1975-76, 8.58 percent of the headcount faculty and 13.06 percent of the VCCS FTE faculty held tenure. These percentages will decline over time as a result of normal attrition and faculty growth.

As enrollments at the community colleges continue to grow, the numbers of faculty employed can be anticipated to do the same. The characteristics of these faculty members will determine, to a major degree, the complexion of the institutions.

Finances

The rapid growth of the Virginia system of community colleges is also evident from its income and expenditure patterns. Regardless of the yardstick considered, the increases in the resources committed to and expended by the VCCS have been dramatic.

Funds appropriated for the maintenance and operation of the community colleges have grown from $15 million in the 1966-68 biennium to $179 million in 1976-78, Table 12, for an increase of over 1000 percent. The corresponding increase

TABLE 12

BIENNIAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

1966-68 to 1976-78

	VCCS Appropriations	Percent of Total Higher Education Appropriations	Percent Increase Over Previous Biennium
1966-68	15,097,720	8.10	-
1968-70	33,453,650	12.35	122
1970-72	53,056,391	13.405	59
1972-74	94,650,210	16.68	78
1974-76	131,569,785	17.90	39
1976-78	179,107,400	18.46	36

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

for all other state-supported institutions of higher education was only 360 percent. Thus, as shown in Table 12, the percentage of the total higher education appropriations flowing to the VCCS has grown from about 8 percent to over 18 percent during the six biennia. While the percent increase in the VCCS appropriations as compared to the previous biennium has decreased over the period, the community college appropriations have consistently grown at a faster rate than those of the state's senior institutions of higher education.

In appropriating funds across the various sectors of state government, the Virginia General Assembly has substantially increased both the dollar amount and the percentage of the General Fund, state tax dollars, appropriated to the community college system in each biennia of the system's operation. While the rate of increase has slowed in recent biennia as fewer and fewer new institutions have been established, over the twelve year period the increase has been above 900 percent. General Fund dollars appropriated to the state's senior colleges and universities have grown only 380 percent over the same time period. It follows, therefore, that the proportion of the higher education General Fund dollars appropriated to the community colleges has increased while the senior institutions' proportion has declined. As Table 13 shows, the community colleges received over 25 percent of the General Fund dollars appropriated to the institu-

TABLE 13

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL ACTIVITIES
1966-68 to 1976-78

	Senior Institutions		Community Colleges		Other 2-Yr Institutions	
	$	% of Total	$	% of Total	$	% of Total
1966-68	$ 79,490,545	83.7	$ 12,919,090	13.6	$2,505,945	2.6
1968-70	121,643,205	80.5	26,767,385	17.7	2,705,385	1.8
1970-72	179,377,875	81.0	40,719,870	18.4	1,306,195	.6
1972-74	230,672,160	75.2	75,024,255	24.4	1,162,255	.4
1974-76	306,184,145	74.0	106,250,470	25.7	1,449,020	.4
1976-78	381,470,280	73.8	133,268,140	25.8	1,796,245	.3

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

tions of higher education for the 1976-78 biennium.

When the General Fund appropriations for educational and general activities are examined on a per-student basis, Table 14, the community colleges exhibit a different pattern than the other institutions. Both the senior colleges and universities and the two-year institutions other than community colleges have received steadily increasing appropriations per full-time equivalent student. The community colleges, on the other hand, began with an appropriation per FTE student figure above the senior institutions. It declined for two biennia, reaching a low of $927 in 1970-72, and then increased in each subsequent period. This trend is at least partially explained by the high start-up costs and low enrollment levels experienced during the system's initiation. As the institutions developed and enrollments grew, the appropriations per FTE student could be reduced for several years.

In the current biennium, the General Fund dollars appropriated for each community college FTE student are approximately 75 percent of those for students at the senior institutions. Although the dollars per FTE student are not as high, the state supplies a larger proportion of the income to the community colleges than to the four-year colleges and universities. In 1975-76, the community colleges received about 71 percent of their educational and general income from the state General Fund, while the senior insti-

TABLE 14

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL ACTIVITIES PER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT

1966-68 to 1976-78

	Senior Institutions	Community Colleges	Other 2-Year Institutions
1966-68	772	1,517	434
1968-70	1,006	1,049	849
1970-72	1,249	927	819
1972-74	1,418	1,256	919
1974-76	1,661	1,279	1,129
1976-78	1,915	1,447	1,287

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

tutions received approximately 61 percent from this same source. The contrary is true of student tuition and fee income. While the senior institutions received 28 percent of their educational and general income from this source in 1975-76, only 19 percent of the community income was derived from student charges. This differential represents a conscious policy on the part of the VCCS to keep its tuition levels low and therefore reduce the financial barrier to individuals desiring to attend a postsecondary institution. Tuition, which was first set at $135 per year in 1966-67, was $300 in 1975-76, for Virginia residents.

As would be expected, the expenditure patterns of the VCCS are closely associated with those of income. The expenditures of Virginia's community colleges for educational and general activities have grown from $2 million in 1966-67 to over $78 million in 1975-76, for a ten year increase of close to 4000 percent, Table 15. The yearly percentage increase has declined over the decade; however, the system has expended a larger proportion of the total of the educational and general expenditures in each subsequent year.

On a per FTE student basis, the educational and general expenditures of the community colleges have more than doubled, rising from about $850 in 1966-67 to almost $1750 in 1975-76. Approximately 60 percent of these expenditures went to provide instruction, with slightly over 20 percent being used on administration and general expenses in 1975-76. Eleven

TABLE 15

EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL ACTIVITIES 1966-67 to 1975-76

	VCCS Educational and General Expenditures	% of Total Educational and General Expenditures	% Increase Over Previous Year
1966-67	$ 2,024,963	2.65	-
1967-68	6,911,916	7.31	241
1968-69	14,544,996	11.61	110
1969-70	17,867,673	12.19	23
1970-71	22,687,213	12.93	27
1971-72	29,358,235	14.38	29
1972-73	42,114,731	18.45	43
1973-74	54,621,508	21.08	30
1974-75	63,619,693	21.64	16
1975-76	78,758,223	22.96	24

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

percent of the system's 1975-76 expenses were for maintaining the physical plant area and about 4 percent were utilized for the libraries of the colleges. Smaller proportions were spent on public service, off-campus instruction and organized activities related to instruction. These expenditure distributions were similar to those experienced by the senior institutions.

As with other measures, the finances of the VCCS point out that the system has become an integral component of higher education in the Commonwealth.

Facilities

Just as the volume of institutions, students, program offerings, dollar expenditures and faculty associated with the Virginia Community College System have expanded dramatically over the last decade, so have the physical facilities constructed to meet the space needs of the system.

While data is not available which differentiates space at community colleges from that at other two-year institutions, Table 16 does display the ten-year growth in educational and general (E&G) space, that space essential to an institution's instruction, research and public service activities, across the three major sectors of higher education in the state. Between 1966 and 1975, the amount of E&G space at Virginia's state-supported institutions of higher education nearly doubled. The senior colleges increased their E&G facilities by approximately 55 percent. Over the

TABLE 16

GROWTH IN EDUCATIONAL AND
GENERAL SPACE AT VIRGINIA'S
STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS OF
HIGHER EDUCATION
1966 to 1975

(To Nearest 1,000 Square Feet of Space)

	1966	1975	Percent Increase 1966-1975
All Institutions	6,002 sq. ft.	11,700 sq. ft.	95
Doctoral	3,875	6,056	56
Other four-year	2,009	3,120	55
Two-year	119	2,525	2,022

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

same time period, space allocated to E&G activities at the two-year institutions grew by over 2000 percent. Thus, while the two-year institutions occupied 2 percent of the total E&G space in 1966, they had 21 percent of the educational and general space in 1975. Only 5 percent of the 1975 E&G space at two-year institutions existed in 1966, but over half of the E&G space at the senior institutions in 1975 was built prior to 1966.

While educational and general space grew rapidly from 1966 to 1975, the data in Table 17 suggest that, in general, the expansion has not kept pace with increases in the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students. In terms of the growth in E&G space in relation to the growth in FTE students, the average square feet per FTE student for all institutions of higher education decreased from 83.5 to 77.3 between 1970 and 1975. For the two-year institutions, however, the space per FTE student increased by 8 percent, from 47.0 to 50.8 square feet, over the five year period.

The funding required to finance this space expansion in the two-year sector is demonstrated in Tables 18 and 19. Capital outlay appropriations for educational and general purposes at two-year institutions, Table 18, grew dramatically through the 1972-74 biennium and then began a trend of tapering off. The same trend is evident with regard to the proportion of support received from the General Fund, state tax dollars, as compared with Special Funds, institutional

TABLE 17

GROWTH IN EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL SPACE IN RELATION TO GROWTH IN FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS AT VIRGINIA'S STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS

1970 to 1975

	Square Feet per FTE Student		Percentage Change in Space per FTE Student
	1970	1975	
All Institutions	83.5	77.3	-7
Doctoral	101.1	97.3	-4
Other 4-year*	82.0	79.4	-3
2-year	47.0	50.8	+8

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

*Data for Virginia Military Institute are omitted from this table.

TABLE 18

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL CAPITAL OUTLAY 1966-68 to 1976-78

	Two-Year Institutions*	% of Total	Source of Funds Distribution	
			% General Fund	% Special Fund
966-68	4,798,515	7	100	0
968-70	12,812,235	14	16	84
970-72	13,357,000	51	67	33
972-74	24,176,390	33	96	4
974-76	7,071,265	34	56	44
976-78	1,706,950	8	27.2	72.8

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

*Includes appropriations to all two-year institutions which maintained two-year status throughout the period.

TABLE 19

CONSTRUCTION FINANCING
VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
1966-67 to 1975-76

	State	Local	Federal	Total
1966-67	$ 3,252,043	$ 667,667	$ 2,832,848	$ 6,752,558
1967-68	2,927,003	3,464,588	3,804,244	10,195,835
1968-69	865,908	2,985,819	1,146,631	4,998,358
1969-70	5,131,726	1,750,906	2,652,385	9,535,017
1970-71	6,259,589	1,592,811	3,344,382	11,196,782
1971-72	11,212,024	2,579,105	2,798,750	16,589,879
1972-73	21,037,511	3,790,059	1,369,129	26,196,699
1973-74	402,396	268,712	-	671,108
1974-75	3,339,815	1,641,685	-	4,981,500
1975-76	49,521	778,775	61,842	890,138
TOTALS	$54,477,536	$19,520,127	$18,010,211	$92,007,874

SOURCE: Data Files, Virginia Department of Community Colleges (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

and bond revenues. Actual capital outlay expenditures by the VCCS as well as funds available for such projects, Table 19, also exhibit the general pattern of increasing and then decreasing emphasis on facility construction over the last decade. Each of these trends is consistent with the system's pattern of development in which the majority of institutions were incorporated into the system during the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Of the space existing at two-year institutions in the fall of 1975, 66.1 percent was dedicated to educational and general activities. For the senior institutions, 41.5 percent and 37.8 percent of the space at the doctoral and other four-year colleges, respectively, was categorized as being of an E&G nature. Thus, a much larger proportion of the total space at two-year colleges supported the primary functions of education than at the senior institutions. A percentage distribution of 1975 educational and general space, Table 20, reveals that classrooms and class labs occupy 53.2, 23.2, and 33 percent of the E&G space at two-year, doctoral, and other four-year institutions, respectively. This distribution reflects the focus upon teaching traditionally found at two-year colleges.

While the growth in two-year college facilities has been dramatic over the last decade, the needs in this area are far from being fully satisfied. The VCCS has estimated itself to be 1.8 million square feet short of its building needs based

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL SPACE

Fall 1975

	Doctoral	4-Year	2-Year
Classroom	10.0%	14.8%	21.4%
Class Lab.	11.5%	14.6%	29.6%
Spec. Class Lab.	1.7%	3.6%	2.2%
Library	13.4%	12.8%	12.1%
Faculty Office	13.2%	11.9%	9.8%
Other Educ. & Gen.	50.2%	42.3%	24.9%

SOURCE: Institutional Data Files, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (Richmond, Virginia: 1977).

on the guidelines prescribed by the Council of Higher Education. Using projected enrollments to estimate future needs for additional educational and general space, the Council of Higher Education has projected needed increases of 28 percent by 1983-84 and 32 percent by 1986-87 in the E&G space at two-year institutions.

Thus, although each of the twenty-three institutions called for in the Master Plan are in operation, facility development will remain an important priority of the VCCS in the decade ahead.

Chapter 4 : Selected Educational and Governmental Influentials: Initial Expectations

Thirty-six persons were invited to participate in formal interviews. This population was divided into two sub-groups. The first consisted of educational and governmental leaders involved in the initiation of the community college system in Virginia. To the extent feasible, responses were obtained from selected individuals in the following groups as of June 30, 1966:

Executive Branch of State Government
- Governor
- Executive Assistant to the Governor

Legislative Branch of State Government
- Members of the House Education Committee
- Members of Senate Education Committee

Higher Education Study Commission
- Commission Members

State Board of Education
- Superintendent of Public Instruction

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
- Council Members
- Director
- Associate Director

State Board for Community Colleges
- Board Members
- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor

These groups were selected because they were, in 1966, and are today, providing state-level leadership for higher education in Virginia.

The second sub-group of the population that was interviewed consisted of current, as of June 30, 1976,

office holders and members of the groups previously cited. Some of the members of this second sub-group were unfamiliar with the founding of the system and, therefore, unable to comment on the original expectations except as assimilated since that point in time. Others, however, were familiar with the system's development from its inception until the present; and, in fact, some held the leadership positions in 1976 which they held in 1966. There was, therefore, some overlap between the membership of the two sub-groups in terms of both those individuals who currently hold the positions they occupied in 1966 and those persons who have switched jobs during the decade but still occupy a position which placed them within the scope of the study.

Members from the groups cited above were selected to be on the interviewee roster based on the following criteria:

1. For those positions where a single person occupied the office, that individual was cited on the interviewee roster.
2. The selection criteria for members of the House and Senate Education Committees to be interviewed was as follows:
   a. All members of the 1966 Education Committees who were serving in the 1976 Virginia General Assembly were selected.
   b. All members of the 1976 Education Committees who served in the 1966 Virginia General Assembly were selected.

c. If an individual could appear on both the 1966 and 1976 rosters, he was listed only on the 1966 list.

3. The members of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) and the Virginia Department of Community Colleges (VDCC) selected to be interviewed were those who served in official leadership positions in 1966 or 1976. These persons were selected to represent the two groups since they are likely to be the most knowledgeable single element due to their intimate involvement with the groups' work.

4. The members of the Higher Education Study Commission selected to be interviewed were the members of the Study's executive committee.

Two rosters, one for governmental and the other for educational interviewees, were developed from these criteria. They are provided in Appendix A—Interviewee Rosters.

By far the most frequently cited reason given by the entire group of interviewees for establishing Virginia's system of community colleges was to provide increased opportunities for post high school education to the citizens of the Commonwealth. This is an exceedingly general statement. It does, however, reflect the broad expectation associated with the VCCS at its initiation.

The general desire for increased postsecondary educational opportunities developed for a number of reasons. Foremost in the minds of selected educational and governmental leaders was Virginia's poor standing in relation to other states with respect to its college-going rate. It was pointed out that Virginia's percentage of college-age population in college was unfavorably low in the mid 1960s and had been so for many years. By 1966, however, a strong sentiment had developed among state leaders that Virginia was capable of making a better effort and had an obligation to do so.

In the early 1960s, a tremendous effort around the country was going into community colleges. The increasing notoriety and popularity of the community college movements in other states was also cited by a number of interviewees as an important factor in pointing up the shortcomings in Virginia's postsecondary offerings prior to the initiation of the VCCS.

The need was also highlighted by the fact that admission to the state's senior institutions of higher education was becoming increasingly difficult. As one interviewee related, "the mid 1960s in Virginia saw hoards of high school students wanting to go on to college but unable to obtain admission, and the projections showed an increasing demand for places in post high school education in the years immediately ahead." The impetus to develop a system of community colleges to serve the anticipated increases rather than expand the senior institutions was, as one interviewee pointed out," prompted

by a very understandable economic stimulus on the part of the state executives." There was an initial expectation, according to most interviewees, that it would be less expensive and probably more efficient in the long run to establish two-year colleges than to continue to add on to the four-year, residential institutions. The community colleges were seen as a way to alleviate the tremendous pressures on the four-year colleges to expand to accommodate the mounting numbers of individuals seeking entry into higher education.

In addition, the wave of egalitarianism in higher education was spreading. Several interviewees noted that broader equal opportunity requirements were emerging in a more clear-cut fashion than had been the case in the past and that talk of open access was increasing both in Virginia and nation-wide.

Virginia's poor higher educational position as compared with other states, the growth of the community college movement nation-wide, the demographic pressures, and desires for equal opportunity and open access were seen by the interviewees as coalescing in the mid 1960s and giving the thrust for Virginia to move ahead and expand its postsecondary offerings.

The virtually unanimous consensus surrounding the goal of increased opportunities, however, did not carry over to the identification of specific goals by which this could be achieved. Most interviewees stated their initial expectations either in terms of the clientele to be served or the programs to be offered.

With regard to prospective clientele, a number of charac-

teristics were cited as deserving attention by the community colleges. One mentioned frequently throughout the interviews was the limited financial capability of students to pay for their education. It was felt that the community college should provide educational opportunities for the many individuals who for economic reasons were not able to attend a residential college. The awareness of the financial pressures which kept many individuals out of higher education caused one interviewee to respond that a major goal of the community college system was to "put some sort of college education within commuting distance of every Virginia citizen, so that those who could not afford--for family, financial or business reasons--to be away from home could at least make a two-year start on a college education." The popular goal of providing education at low cost to the student also resulted from an awareness of the fact that many citizens were not able to pay the tuition at the state's senior institutions of higher education. Thus, the goals of providing postsecondary education within commuting distance of all citizens and at low tuition rates were intended to meet the needs of those financially unable to partake of the postsecondary education provided by Virginia prior to 1966. These goals were unanimously endorsed by all the interviewees.

Another frequently cited goal related to clientele was that of serving students scholastically unprepared to attend a four-year college or university. At the time the community college development was under consideration, the state's

senior institutions of higher education, as a general rule, had selective admission standards, and a large number of individuals were unable to meet the entrance requirements. Several of the interviewees mentioned the poor high school program provided in rural areas of the state and cited the community college as a vehicle to bridge the gap between high school and the state's senior institutions for students from these schools. Aside from those individuals with inferior preparation, there was consensus among those interviewed that the "late bloomer," the individual who had not performed well in high school for any of a variety of reasons, deserved a chance to further his/her education beyond the high school level. In fact, a majority felt that the community colleges should be open and available to all youth with the desire and motivation to attend, regardless of previous academic attainment. Several interviewees, however, did note that persons believed "incapable" of doing the work should not be admitted. The reasons cited for this belief included the statements that attempting to educate such individuals would be a waste of state money and that these persons would hold back others in the classes since the quality of the student body affects the quality of the program. Those expressing this view had no criteria to offer to accomplish this screening.

Another community college purpose identified by the interviewees was that of providing opportunities for individuals interested in furthering their skills in non-academic areas.

At least half of the leaders interviewed indicated that at the time of the development of the community colleges there was a growing awareness within the state that everyone did not need a traditional college education. And, in fact, that in this age of increasing technology some of the skills in short supply in the society were not developed through the standard college curriculum. Thus, serving individuals interested in obtaining or enhancing job-oriented skills was seen as an important initial goal of the VCCS.

While each of these goals was mentioned first in the context of the benefits to be derived by the individual citizens of the state, most interviewees were also quick to note the advantages which would accrue to the Commonwealth by serving these diverse clientele. Several interviewees spoke of the values to be derived by the state from a more informed citizenry as an important objective. Almost all, however, cited the economic and tax benefits which would rebound to the state from the increased earnings individuals could expect to receive as a result of their community college attendance.

There was a wide range in the initial expectations of the interviewees regarding the role the community college should play in providing services to the adult population of the state. Most believed that it was appropriate for the community college to help adults update their skills or retrain for new occupations. The controversial area was that of providing self-enrichment courses for adults, and most

particularly senior citizens. Reactions to such a goal ranged from a statement that the community college was not intended to be a "kindergarten for the elderly" to the belief that, with the great strides being made in prolonging life, the state had an obligation to meet the needs of its senior citizens and that the community college was well suited to help to perform this function. About half of the interviewees stated that serving the adult population in this fashion was among their initial expectations, but most of them agreed they had not thought it should receive top priority.

In terms of the programmatic offerings seen by the interviewees as initial goals of the VCCS, two--a vocational/technical offering and a college-transfer program--were acknowledged by all.

As perceived by the interviewees, the primary motive behind offering technical training in the community colleges was to enhance the industrial development of the state. It was often stated that in the middle 1960s, the Commonwealth had embarked on a concentrated and coordinated effort to attract desirable industry into Virginia. It was recognized that to accomplish this goal, a trained labor force as well as provision for the continual retraining of people was essential. At the same time, as one interviewee stated, there was a problem approaching serious proportions in the fact that secondary schools seemed to prepare people for further liberal arts education but did very little to prepare people for jobs. Thus, nowhere within the state's educational

structure prior to 1966 was emphasis placed on preparing individuals for technically-oriented jobs. The community college was seen as the best means of providing this training for a variety of reasons: they were to be dispersed throughout the state, tuition was to be held to a minimum, admission standards were to be minimal, and the institutions were to be responsive to the needs of each community.

Since the community colleges were seen as a mechanism by which to reduce enrollment pressures on the senior institutions, it followed that most persons interviewed expected the community colleges to provide the first two years of a college education. Whether or not the community college offerings were to mirror those of the first two years at the senior institutions in terms of both scope and quality was never clearly articulated by those interviewed. General consensus was expressed, however, on the expectation that the community college courses be of sufficient caliber to be accepted by the senior institutions when students desired to transfer.

An additional function with regard to transfer courses was noted by some of the leaders interviewed. While giving more people an opportunity to go to college, it was felt that the community college could at the same time serve to "weed out" those individuals who were not "college material." The screening process for higher education was seen by several of the interviewees as appropriately resting with the community college rather than the more expensive four-year insti-

tutions.

Another goal of the VCCS cited by some interviewees was that of responding to specific requests from business and industry for certain specialized programs. While presented by a minority of all persons interviewed, those that did cite this expectation saw it as an exceedingly important function of the VCCS.

The greatest variation in responses was related to the goal of offering continuing education and self-enrichment courses. Few interviewees identified these types of courses as being among their original expectations. When questioned on the subject, however, a majority responded that they saw no reason the community college should not offer such courses. There was general agreement that self-enrichment programs were not regarded as being of equal importance with the transfer and technical offerings.

To provide a full accounting of all initial goals cited, those identified by a single respondent are summarized as a matter of record:

1) to help prepare individuals for satisfactory, productive use of their leisure time

2) to respond to the needs of the local community by providing community services

3) to discourage the multiplication of branches of the state's senior institutions

4) to offer postsecondary educational opportunities on a part-time basis

5) to provide dignity to certain types of jobs.

The preceding discussion of initial expectations points out that none of the selected interview participants had personal goals for the VCSS which differed substantially from those publicly discussed and debated at the time of its founding. Additionally, it should be noted that all of the original goals cited by the interviewees had been stated in the published materials and documents advocating the establishment of the community college system.

Chapter 5 : Perceived Successes and Failures

The major points cited by the selected educational and governmental leaders regarding the success and failures of the VCCS are discussed in this chapter.

Every interviewee rated the first decade of community college development in Virginia as having been highly successful. This is not to say they did not identify some problem areas. However, each person interviewed was supportive of the system and the progress it had made to date, notwithstanding its weaknesses. One interviewee stated that "the community college approach was the greatest thing Virginia had done in education in the century." And, another commented that "the system, which had grown by leaps and bounds, was so widely accepted and so well received that it made one wonder why it had not been implemented a decade earlier." Most admitted that the VCCS had exceeded their initial expectations for its first decade of operations and felt that the results spoke for themselves. A member of the General Assembly remarked, "I do not know of any program which has been carried out more faithfully to the intent of its legislation than has the community college program."

A governmental leader exemplified the responses of the interviewees when he stated that "Any objective assessment of the first decade of the Virginia Community College System would have to reach the conclusion that it had been a spectacular success." He pointed out, however, that this did not mean mistakes had not been made or that there were

not things which might have been done differently. He noted there was a great surge of wanting to get on with the job but stressed that the system had been developed in a prudent way. "The system was needed, it had been needed, and the state was just beginning to address the needs," he observed.

Of all the specific successful aspects of the VCCS noted by the interviewees, that of enrollments was praised most frequently. There was nearly unanimous agreement among those interviewed that the rapid growth in the number of students served by the system during each of its first ten years exceeded what they thought would happen. A member of the Virginia General Assembly expressed the sentiment of many when he stated, "The community colleges have grown in enrollment beyond the wildest expectations of anybody; we never dreamed that they would go to the level they have."

In addition to the numbers of individuals being served, pleasure was expressed by a majority of the interviewees over the demographic characteristics of the individuals attending community colleges. Several interviewees noted the initial fear that the VCCS would emerge to serve only the poor, both financially and academically, minority students. However, as one interviewee pointed out, "there is a very good mix of young and old, black and white, and rich and poor persons at the community colleges." Another leader stated that the system had made "tremendous strides in making opportunities available to all people without promoting any single interest group. The mix in racial, ethnic, age and

socioeconomic status of the VCCS's students was considered by a majority of the interviewees as a very positive accomplishment of the system.

The ability of the system to attract large numbers and diverse types of students points out another aspect of the VCCS which the interviewees thought had been quite successful--"the gaining public acceptance of the system." "The community college has captured the public's imagination," stated one interviewee. All those interviewed thought that, on the whole, the public acceptance of the VCCS had been excellent. Several cited the surprisingly high enrollments as being indicative of the reception the community colleges have had across the state. A number of the leaders emphasized that they found the enthusiasm for education which the community college operation had generated to be remarkable.

The broad range of community college offerings were seen as a major achievement by most persons interviewed. "The opportunities for people to advance beyond the high school years have increased tremendously as a result of the VCCS," stated one interviewee. Although one leader stated that the balance between the technical and the liberal arts programs had never worked out because the attention and prestige was directed towards the college transfer offerings, he was very much in the minority as most persons interviewed did not think this to be the case. Rather, they expressed the opinion that the transfer and technical programs had been held in good balance. In fact, one governmental

interviewee admitted an initial fear that, educators being educators, the academics would become more important than the technical and that students that should not be would be gently pressured towards the academics. "The technical end has been upheld," he stated, "and there has been no outcropping of my original fears."

The interviewees evaluated the liberal arts programs primarily on the ability of the community college students to transfer to and succeed in the senior institutions. The consensus was that success had been achieved in having the four-year institutions accept community college graduates. Additionally, not only did they feel that the acceptance rate had been good, but most interviewees were also of the opinion that students transferring to senior institutions from the community colleges were able to keep up with the advanced work and remain in good standing at the senior institutions.

The leaders' perceptions of the degree of success achieved in the vocational/technical programs were very positive. "There have been a great number of people not particularly suited for general education opportunities who have profited so greatly from the chance to pursue their skills," one stated. Most interviewees felt that the community colleges were looking at the job market as they designed courses and that the colleges were doing a good job of matching offerings with needs, thus staying attuned to the job market. The courses offered in each area of the state were also seen as consistent with the needs of the area by a majority of interviewees.

Many of the educational and governmental leaders also noted that the VCCS had been successful in attracting industry into the state and satisfying its needs once located. A number of interviewees remarked that all of the industries they knew of were tremendously pleased with the community colleges and several even stated that business and industrial leaders had commended the state for its community college program. The satisfaction of the industrial community with the community colleges was attributed by several interviewees to the fact that industry has been given a role in the planning of programs and is consulted regarding its needs so that courses can be offered to meet job requirements. The technical offerings of the VCCS were also viewed as a benefit to the state by most persons interviewed. "Without the community colleges," said one leader, "the state would not have the degree of industrial success it has experienced in the last decade." As a result, income levels have been lifted, more people have better jobs and increasing revenues now flow to the individuals and the state. "I do not know of anything that has been more generally helpful to the Commonwealth," stated one interviewee in relation to the VCCS.

A number of other accomplishments of the VCCS were cited by one or more interviewees. The community college system was credited with motivating young people by "capturing them and instilling the desire for a profession or vocation before they lost the thirst for further education." The VCCS was also viewed as being successful in providing opportunities

for individuals, particularly those who work, to improve their education or skills on a part-time basis. Considerable positive stress was given to the fact that the community colleges were serving the needs of older individuals going back to school to freshen their skills or for new learning. In addition to the individual benefits, several interviewees cited the benefits flowing to the localities as a result of the community colleges. One noted that the community colleges helped the local governments, especially in rural areas, by serving as a source of research. The community colleges were also seen by the interviewees as tremendous assets across the state and as positive influences on the economy, social life, and cultural life of many of the communities in which they were located. "The community colleges have worked hard at relating themselves to the community, involving themselves in community activities, and providing community services," explained one of the leaders. A number of those interviewed pointed out that a sense of pride had developed in the community colleges which in turn had created a sense of pride in the localities and in the state at large.

The rapidity with which the system developed not only in terms of students but also in physical facilities was noted by several interviewees. The establishment of twenty-three community colleges in a period of less than ten years was described as "one of the most efficient development activities in education in Virginia" by one leader. A number of other interviewees had reactions similar to the legislator who said,

"I did not expect all of this--the number of schools, the number of campuses, the number of students--to happen so fast; it seems like it all happened over night." Another interviewee stated that the VCCS was a "fantastic system that nobody felt would grow as fast as it has and fill the hole which it has as well as it has." The same individual went on to point out, however, that anything that grows as fast as the VCCS is going to have some rough edges. "While the overall accomplishments of the system have been quite satisfying," stated another interviewee, "the desire to get the job done with dispatch has, at times, resulted in errors being made."

The rapid rate of establishing the community colleges was identified as the basis for a number of the weaknesses attributed to the VCCS. This was particularly true with regard to the finances of the system. "Anything that grew so rapidly and so fast was bound to spend some money unwisely," declared one interviewee. The majority of those interviewed agreed that any inefficient use of funds which might have occurred during the first ten years of the operation of the VCCS was probably attributable to the rapid expansion of the system. No one interviewed, however, was aware of any financial mismanagement associated with the community college development. "Like every new project," an interviewee declared, "there is a lot of lost motion and some money spent that might not have been by more experienced people with a record to look back on."

There was concern expressed over the costs of running

the system. Both educational and governmental interviewees agreed that the cost of the system had been greater than anticipated. One reason for this, as cited by a number of leaders, was the extensive inflationary spiral which no one had expected at the time of the system's founding. Concerns over cost were tempered by the system's accomplishments in the eyes of most persons interviewed. "The system has been expensive, but in relation to the product, I think it has been relatively inexpensive," stated one leader. A member of the General Assembly commented that the "importance of what the institutions were trying to do outweighed the cost." Another noted that while the community colleges had been costly, all educational programs were costly but that it was important to measure the cost by the benefits which flow from it. On the whole, the interviewees seemed willing to accept the costs which had been associated with the system.

An educational interviewee, however, predicted that concerns over the operating costs of the VCCS would continue and exacerbate rather than subside. "As more cost information becomes available, the tremendous costs associated with providing some of the community college programs will be evident." He hypothesized that as knowledge of the cost of individual community college programs becomes more generally known, questions would be asked of the system and changes would likely result.

Financial concerns were raised by a number of interviewees in the context of the scope of programs offered.

Opinions regarding the VCCS offerings were split into three categories. One group thought the system was providing too many programs, another thought too few programs were available and the third group considered the offerings to be appropriate. Of those concerned that the community colleges' scope of offerings was too broad, cost was a justification given for reducing programs. Some of these interviewees thought that too many citizens were using the community colleges for something to do rather than to advance their education or prepare for a vocation. "The purpose of the community college was not to pick up anybody on the street that wanted to get off the street and send them to a community college regardless of everything else," stated an interviewee.

Several others noted that the community colleges were getting into "fringe areas" in their program offerings. Of particular concern were courses offered for personal enrichment or self-satisfaction. Most interviewees observed that these types of courses are provided at no cost to the state. However, the opinion was expressed by a large number of those interviewed that the general public was not aware of the self-supporting nature of these offerings, and that, as a result, such courses were to some degree hurting the reputation of the community colleges. While most interviewees were concerned only that the public understand how personal enrichment courses were funded, a small number did not think such programs were appropriate for a community college, irrespective of the funding base.

Questions were also raised, by a minority of the interviewees, as to whether the VCCS was trying to do too much for too many in terms of program offerings. "The community college system is run without restraints," stated an interviewee, "but, it is not practical for it to attempt to respond to every need." It was stated that trying to do so would raise the costs unjustifiably. The VCCS was also criticized for "drumming up business" through the use of advertising and, therefore, enticing individuals who had little reason for attending to enroll in the institutions.

At the other extreme, examples were cited by interviewees indicating they did not believe the community colleges were providing adequate services. Several stated that the VCCS had not placed sufficient emphasis on retraining activities and had not been as successful in the upgrading of the adult population as they had hoped. One interviewee questioned whether the community colleges "had done all they should have done to identify those who ought to be encouraged and challenged in the technical area." Several others also felt that the community colleges and even the high schools should try and find students talented in the technical areas and encourage them in these fields. A few interviewees stated that the self-improvement courses of the community colleges had not experienced as much success as they would have liked them to have. "For people out of school for a while, it will take a real effort to get them back, just publishing the courses in the paper is not enough," stated one interviewee. A small

group of interviewees supported the position that the community colleges should increase their efforts to attract students since "the individuals the community colleges need most to reach are the ones without the initiative and drive to knock on the doors of the community colleges. Rather, it is necessary to go out and recruit them into the system."

It is important to note, however, that the majority of those interviewed were satisfied that the programmatic offerings of the VCCS were adequate.

The relationship of the VCCS with other sectors of education within the state was another problem area identified by some interviewees. The primary concern, expressed by close to one-third of the leaders, involved the duplication of vocational/technical offerings between the secondary schools and the community colleges. It was the opinion of those raising the concern that, while this had been a long-recognized problem, a satisfactory solution had not yet been reached. The coordination of the community colleges and the senior institutions in regard to continuing education programs was a concern of a single interviewee. Several of tnose interviewed also noted the mounting competition between the state's community colleges and senior institutions for both students and dollars as the resources available become more limited. There was also an interest expressed in having greater cooperation and coordination among the public and private postsecondary institutions within the state to avoid the possibility of one institution working to the detriment of another.

There were a number of other weaknesses of the VCCS noted by a limited number of interviewees. Two persons expressed concern that the community colleges, at least in terms of their locations, had been forced to operate in a pork barrel, political environment. Several others were worried that the faculty and programs of the community colleges were not of adequate quality. The belief that there was still a lot of public misunderstanding of the VCCS and that some people do not appreciate it for all it is troubled a single interviewee.

Chapter 6 : Future Expectations

The outstanding characteristic of the large majority of responses related to future directions for the VCCS was the lack of proposed major modifications. "The comprehensive system of community colleges established in Virginia has been extremely successful and has proved itself to be sound. I see no reason to change its direction at this point," stated a governmental interviewee. A similar sentiment was echoed by most of those interviewed, and, as one stated, "everyone seems as pleased with the concept today as they were ten years ago." In fact, possible new directions for the system were offered by only a very few interviewees. Refinements to the existing directions, however, were proposed in a number of instances.

The lack of glaring omissions in the initial formulation of the state's system of community colleges was attributed by several interviewees to the fact that Virginia was able to study the patterns emerging in other states prior to implementing its own. "Virginia's wait, whether planned or accidental, was fortunate in that the state could profit from mistakes made by others and from the successes which they achieved," one leader observed. Whether or not the influence of other states was a major factor, all those interviewed concluded that the VCCS had been exceedingly well thought out and soundly planned at the outset.

While a few interviewees predicted that no changes would be made to the system, most leaders expressed the view that

the community college was designed, by nature, to be a flexible institution and minor changes and adjustments should be anticipated. A number of reasons were cited for the need for flexibility. Several noted that the characteristics of the population would change over time and variations in offerings might be essential in order to meet the needs of a possibly different clientele. Additionally, it was pointed out that industry does not stand still, and that while the training needs of industry will continue far into the future, the type of training can be expected to change as technology advances at breakneck speed. The needs of industry must be under constant consideration, stated one interviewee, since "it is silly to train people for work if there is none for them to do." It is also important, several leaders noted, that the community colleges remain aware of other societal changes so that the supply and demand for all courses may be kept in balance. The following remark characterizes the view expressed by most persons interviewed: "I envision that the community college system will continue but that it will tailor its opportunities and responsibilities to meet the changing conditions in the community, state, industrial sector and constituency." Therefore, while all agreed that the system was pursuing the right path, there was also consensus that careful attention should be maintained to recognize symptoms which might suggest modifications for the future.

A major factor seen by a large majority of the interviewees as potentially necessitating changes in the system

was the precarious financial position of the Commonwealth during 1976-77. Should state resources continue to be in very short supply with major funding restraints being placed on the community colleges, several implications were predicted for the system. One, which, as a few leaders noted, has already begun to occur, would be increased scrutiny of accounting methods and procedures to insure full and detailed accountability for funds entrusted to the system. "There may have been less attention paid to every penny in the past than there will have to be in the future," stated one leader.

In addition to possible closer external checking on the system's accounting practices, almost half the interviewees thought that, in the next decade, increased attention would be given by the executive and legislative branches of state government to all activities of the system to see that each was necessary. Rather than branching out into new areas, most interviewees agreed that the efforts in the immediate years ahead should be toward assuring that the programs previously developed are as efficient and effective as possible. Several of the interviewees raised, without answering, the question of whether or not the community colleges were already attempting to do too much for too many, especially in light of the cost of the operation to the state.

It was suggested by several of the leaders interviewed that particular attention should be given by the system to the things the community colleges could do in preference to the senior institutions. This same point was hinted at by

the interviewees who desired that the missions of the various educational sectors within the state be more precisely defined than they had been in the past. "Unnecessary and wasteful competition for students between institutions will be fostered if missions are not carefully defined," declared an educational leader. If better differentiation were to be established, the interviewees believed that there could be a reduction in the number of overlapping offerings and therefore a financial savings to the Commonwealth. It was also noted that diversity would be promoted by such an action. Along the same lines, one leader expressed the hope that the community college system would strive for greater cooperation and coordination with the state's private institutions of higher education. Further, a few interviewees commented that there were not clear lines of authority and responsibility between the State Board of Education, the State Board of Community Colleges and the Council of Higher Education for Virginia, but that they were sorely needed.

The setting of future priorities was discussed by a number of the interviewees in the context of financial considerations. "Given the limited resources available, it is not possible for the community colleges to respond to every need," declared one interviewee. Another stated that "just because we have the schools, we do not have to offer everything that anybody might want; the system cannot afford to do everything for everybody." It was the consensus of the interviewees that if choices had to be made, the highest

priorities should be postsecondary education in technical fields and the liberal arts. The provision of adult education was seen as depending upon the state's ability to afford it. Some interviewees were more anxious than others that the community colleges refrain from providing opportunities geared towards the post college age population. A few noted, however, that they would like to see the community colleges place increased emphasis on serving the adult population and providing increased opportunities for the retraining and self-enrichment of these individuals.

Limiting the number of citizens the community colleges would serve was also suggested as a mechanism by which priorities could be established. "Some sort of minimum standards could be set up to avoid having to further expand the community colleges beyond the bona fide need of at least apparently qualified people," declared one interviewee. Another voiced a similar desire to keep "unqualified" individuals or "known failures" out of the community colleges. It is important to state, however, that only two interviewees expressed this view; in contrast, most were of the opinion that admission standards were contrary to the mission of the community college. Two of the interviewees went so far as to recommend that a new program be instituted whereby unskilled, welfare recipients who might be made employable be brought into the community college system and trained in a trade or vocation.

A few leaders suggested that the community college system

consider the implementation of variable tuition rates. Two possibilities were noted. Increased charges could be levied against those capable of paying a larger share of the costs or a variable pattern of tuition rates based upon the type of program in which an individual was enrolled and the purpose for which she/he was attending could be instituted. The reaction of most interviewees regarding future tuition charges at the community colleges was that they should remain low in comparison with the senior institutions but should keep pace with inflation. They stressed the point that they did not want the charges to rise to a level which would be prohibitive to a large portion of society.

There were several other specific points raised by the interviewees concerning the future directions of the system. Strong sentiment was expressed by two of the leaders against the community colleges moving into athletics and other extracurricular activities. Another voiced the hope that the VCCS would continue to make progress in its attempts to better classify students and counsel them in both academic and career matters. Several commented on the need to maintain or perhaps enhance the quality of the VCCS faculty and programs in the decade ahead. Some discussed the necessity of maintaining a balance between transfer and technical offerings. Still others expressed concern that the physical facility development of the VCCS be completed in an expedient manner. Pointing out that the institutions are expensive resources, a few of the leaders interviewed expressed the de-

sire that the community college facilities be used to the maximum extent possible. Increased attention to the public's image of the community college was recommended by two interviewees, and several observed that efforts should be made to maintain the integrity of the vocational/technical offerings of the system.

In addition to these specific recommendations, many of those interviewed commented in various ways upon the organization of the system itself. All that mentioned the topic were pleased with the total system of twenty-three community colleges and thought that the initial master plan had been carefully conceived. No one recommended a change in the number or location of the institutions making up the system. Several of the educational interviewees questioned whether the highly centralized administrative structure devised to initiate the system was still desirable in a period of maturation. Most of those interviewed, however, believed that a state-wide board charged with policy determination and supervision provided for an efficient, effective program and should be maintained. The central state-level administration was also credited by a few interviewees with keeping the aspirations of the local college boards in check. The local boards were still seen as essential by the interviewees; they were described as serving as the "eyes and ears" of the local community.

Closely related to the organization of the system was the concern expressed by a few of the interviewees that

several recent state-level policies had the potential of affecting the ability of the system to operate with the autonomy it had experienced in the past. In addition to accounting requirements, recent state directives regarding staffing and the establishment of new positions were noted as additional external restrictions on the operation of the system. While not necessitating a change in direction for the VCCS, these requirements were seen by several of the interviewees as restraints on the future operation of the system.

One final suggestion of a small number of the interviewees was that a study be made of the VCCS. "Enough time has gone by and enough questions raised that we need a blue-ribbon panel, with members from both within and outside the state, staffed by professionals, to come in and evaluate the system," stated one governmental interviewee. Aspects of the system cited for possible study included finances, relations with other state institutions, and scope and quality of program offerings.

Despite the suggested modifications for the future outlined above, the overwhelming consensus of the interviewees was in support of the statement that the community colleges were "so firmly established and so well entrenched in Virginia's system of higher education that they will be with us from now on."

Chapter 7 : Summary and Observations

The community college development in Virginia reached its tenth anniversary on July 1, 1976. The intent of this study was to examine that first decade as a prelude to the second. Although the system has been in operation for just over ten years, there has been no systematic analysis of the extent to which the founders' expectations have been met or the degree to which the expectations for the system have changed. The development of institutions is a dynamic process due to the varying influences of environmental factors and the changing nature of organizational goals. Therefore, periodic critical examinations should be made of all institutions.

A variety of initial expectations were cited for Virginia's community colleges. All were directed towards the primary goal of providing increased opportunities for post high school education to the citizens of the Commonwealth. The number of youth unable to partake of higher education as well as the lack of technical training opportunities in the state prior to 1966 were stated as factors leading to the development of the VCCS. The interviewees noted that the system was designed to serve a variety of clientele including: individuals with limited financial capability, those scholastically unprepared to attend a four-year college, persons

interested in furthering their skills in non-academic areas, and adults desiring to extend their education. The primary programmatic thrusts were seen as being vocational/technical and college transfer programs, although continuing education and self-enrichment activities were also cited as goals by a number of the interviewees.

The first decade of community college development in Virginia was rated by each interviewee as having been highly successful. While minor problems were identified, the consensus was that, on the whole, the VCCS had exceeded the original expectations held for it. The rapid growth in enrollments and the diverse types of students served were identified as positive accomplishments. Also praised were the transfer programs, the vocational/technical offerings, and the ability of the system to serve the needs of industry. The VCCS was criticized by some for providing too many programs and by others for offering too few. The majority of those interviewed, however, considered the offerings to be appropriate. While concern was expressed over the cost of the system, most interviewees were satisfied that the accomplishments justified the expense. The relationship of the VCCS with other sectors of education within the state and the quality of the faculty and programs of the community colleges were noted as problems by several of the interviewees.

No major modifications were suggested for the next decade of community college development in Virginia. A number of refinements, however, were proposed. Changing conditions

in industry, society and the population were anticipated to necessitate minor adjustments in the operation of the VCCS. Should state resources continue to be in short supply, the interviewees predicted that the activities of the community college would come under closer scrutiny than had been the case in the past and that the need for establishing more limited future priorities for the system might arise. Most of the leaders interviewed, however, did not favor the establishment of admission standards for the VCCS. Other comments about the future focused on issues such as tuition, facility development and utilization, public acceptance and program quality. A number of interviewees also discussed the organization of the system itself.

This study focused on the perceptions of a highly select group of educational and governmental leaders and community college user groups concerning the past and future of the VCCS. As such, the study has provided only one perspective on the performance of the system. It is important that reactions also be obtained from those directly associated with the system-- students, faculty, administration-- and the general public. The results of such research weighed with those emerging from this study would provide a comprehensive base for formulating future directions for the Virginia Community College System. However, there are some conclusions and implications which can be drawn from the study.

The overwhelming conclusion to be drawn from the study is that the Virginia Community College System is perceived as an outstanding success by the educational and governmental leaders providing direction for higher education in the Commonwealth. It is clear that in just ten years, the community colleges have evolved into a major higher educational component in state. Further, there is no question but that the VCCS has been exceedingly productive in terms of results.

The prognosis for the system's future, as viewed by these same leaders, is highly positive. They perceive that the community colleges will operate in the future much as they have in the past, particularly with regard to goals and objectives. The same can be said of the perceptions of the representatives of the user groups surveyed.

The success which the system has achieved, however, should be viewed cautiously for two reasons, one external to the VCCS and the other internal.

The support and recognition the community college system has gained with members of the Virginia General Assembly may become an obstacle for other sectors of education within the state, and most particularly for the individual senior institutions of higher education. The fiscal resources of the Commonwealth have been in short supply in recent years and while revenue projections are shown as increasing in the years ahead, they do so at a very modest rate. It can,

therefore, be anticipated that state-level funding decisions will become increasingly difficult for the state legislature in the near future.

Aside from the two major state universities none of Virginia's senior institutions has as great a base for citizen support across the state to influence a majority of the state legislators as do the community colleges. By design the community colleges are spread geographically throughout the state and, therefore, are constituents of a substantial majority of the members of the General Assembly. In a manner of speaking, virtually every legislator has her/his "own" community college. If difficult funding priorities must be established by the legislature, the local character of the twenty-three units in the community college system could generate disproportionate support for the system, perhaps at the expense of the senior institutions of higher education. This poses a potential threat not only to the individual senior colleges and universities, but also to the entire higher educational enterprise of the state. It is important therefore that those charged with state-wide higher educational planning responsibilities take appropriate action to impress upon both the educational and governmental leaders of the state the need to maintain a well balanced financial support system for all elements of higher education.

From the point of view of the community college system itself, the outstanding success achieved during the first

decade should be viewed cautiously for several reasons. The rapid growth rate the system has experienced for ten years cannot be expected to continue indefinitely. In fact, it has already started to lessen. While no institution maintains the growth rate associated with its initial years, the danger lies in the fact that initial performance can come to be regarded as the standard against which progress of the institution is measured. Thus, disillusionment may emerge without justification. The period of rapid annual growth for the VCCS is coming to a close. The system should realize it is entering into a new phase in its developmental process and should make this fact known to its many publics so they will not hold unrealistic expectations for the system and consequently judge its future performance unfairly.

Those directing the system should also work to insure that its shining success has not and does not blind them to problems which may exist within the community college system. A number of concerns were voiced by the interviewees including the coordination between the community colleges and other sectors of education within the state, the quality of the faculty and programs of the system and the scope of the VCCS program offerings. While these are not widespread concerns at present, the system should give immediate attention to each of these matters and if, upon thorough investigation, weaknesses are found to exist, prompt corrective measures should be taken. Such efforts could turn minor or

potential problems into positive accomplishments and enhance the future operations of the system.

As the system ages, it will build an ever-growing constituency across the state. The number of industries served by the system, individuals having attended a community college, and communities enhanced by the institution in their area will continually increase over time. This growing body should help to spread the message of the community college across the Commonwealth and provide increased public support for the Virginia Community College System.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEWEE ROSTERS OF EDUCATIONAL AND GOVERNMENTAL LEADERS

Educational Interviewee Roster

	1966	1976
STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA		
DIRECTOR	Prince B. Woodard	Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR	Robert R. Ramsey, Jr.	Gordon K. Davies
MEMBERS	Joseph E. Blackburn Chairman	J. Harvie Wilkinson, Jr. Chairman
		H. Merrill Pasco Vice Chairman
VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES		
CHANCELLOR	Dana B. Hamel	Dana B. Hamel
VICE CHANCELLOR	none	S. V. Burnette
MEMBERS	Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr. Chairman	Gordon C. Willis Chairman
	Daniel C. Lewis Vice Chairman	Carl E. Bain Vice Chairman
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION	Woodrow W. Wilkerson	W. Eugene Campbell
VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY COMMISSION MEMBERS	Sol W. Rawls, Jr. Vice Chairman	
	R. William Arthur	
	William H. McFarlane	
	James W. Mullen, II	
	T. Edward Temple	

Governmental Interviewee Roster

	1966	1976
GOVERNOR	Mills E. Godwin, Jr.	Mills E. Godwin, Jr.
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE GOVERNOR	Carter o. Lowance	Carter O. Lowance
SECRETARY OF EDUCATION	none	Robert R. Ramsey, Jr.
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE	Hunter B. Andrews*	Frederick T. Gray
	Adelard L. Brault*	Willard J. Moody
	Omer L. Hirst*	Stanley C. Walker
	Paul W. Manns*	
	Edward E. Willey*	
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE	George E. Allen	Archibald A. Campbell
	Mary Marshall	
	Dorothy S. McDiarmid*	
	George N. McMath	
	D. French Slaughter	

* Continue to Serve on Same Committee in 1976

NOTES ON THE AUTHORESS

Blenda Woodard Armistead is a fiscal officer for the Virginia State Council of Higher Education. During her nearly two years of service with the Council, she has been responsible for the development of funding policies and formulas used by the various institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Prior to joining the Council, Blenda served as an administrative officer in the Office of the Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System. She was the recipient of a W. K. Kellogg Fellowship at Florida State University where she served as a graduate research assistant in the State and Regional Higher Education Center. Dr. Armistead completed all requirements for the Ph.D. degree at Florida State University in the summer of 1977.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 2 1 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES